DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 888 FL 000 026

By-Hill, Archibald A.

Language Analysis and Language Teaching.

Pub Date Dec 55

Note-15p.; Subsequently published in The Modern Language Journal; v40 n6 p335-345 Oct 1956

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85

Descriptors-Audiolingual Methods, Cultural Context, *Educational Objectives, Grammar, Instructional Materials, *Language Instruction, Language Role, Language Skills, Language Teachers, *Linguistics, Literature, Modern Languages, Pattern Drills (Language), Phonetics, Structural Analysis, Teacher Role, *Teaching Methods, *Textbook Selection

This paper suggests that closer cooperation between teachers and researchers toward a simplification of linguistic terminology and language instruction objectives could result in more effective classroom presentation. Noted as a common error is the primacy given to writing as a vehicle for literature, and the minor attention given to speaking ability, to pronunciation, intonation, articulation, and spelling. Guidelines for language materials selection and teaching techniques are outlined, and modifications of the direct method are suggested. (DS)

EDO 26888

ORGANIZED 1883

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

No. 41 December 1955

LANGUAGE ANALYSIS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

By Archibald A. Hill
University of Texas

The pages which follow are based on the belief that language teachers have an important job to do, and are devoted to doing it. Consequently, if scientific analysis of language produces results which are of use to the language teacher, and if linguistic scientists can state them in a usuable form, these results should sooner or later reach the classroom. Unfortunately, linguistics has an awesome terminology, an uncomfortably rigid technique, and a body of attitudes which sometimes run counter to those established by long tradition and inculcated by much of our education. It is nonetheless possible to speak of linguistics with a minimum of special terminology, with presentation of results rather than exposition of techniques, and an avoidance of attitudes which would appear controversial to the reasonable non-linguist. If the linguist wishes to bring his results to the classroom, he must write of his science in just this spirit, and with a humility which has not always been a part of his make-up.

The linguist's first statement about language is that it is made up of sounds. Other symbolic systems - writing, Morse Code, even hieroglyphics - are secondary representations, and are at best, substitutes for language. Even in our own literate community we learned to speak long before we learned to write, and we carry our daily affairs far more by means of speech than by writing. Yet, since writing enjoys prestige as a permanent record, as the vehicle of literature and as the basis of education, it is easy to forget its secondary position. Many people fall, therefore, into the attitude of regarding writing as the fundamental part of language which is only imperfectly and ephemerally represented by speech. As a result, many statements about language are really about writing.

Most language teachers realize that their first task is to train students to manipulate a set of sound symbols. Even if the aim is to teach the student to read and translate rather than speak, the student must have some means of responding to what he sees with something that he hears. If he can make no sounds at all, he has such a narrow field of stimulation that he will not learn the sequences of letters he is being taught. In some situations - a Latin class, for instance - his sounds do not have to be those of a native, but sounds he has to have, and they have to be systematically enough arranged to that he can made differing responses for

FL 000 026

all the differing items that make up the language. In a modern language, his set of sounds must be as nearly as possible those of a native, since on the very lowest level he must communicate orally, at least with his teacher, who presumably has such a native or near-native set.

Although it is easy to confuse writing and speech, in the language classroom it is disastrous to do so, since if sound and speech are to be taught and mastered, they must be clearly presented. Language teachers can do much to bring about the necessary clarity by examining textbooks to see how well they present the sounds of the tongues they describe. Here are some simple rules by which a textbook can be judged. The rules take the form of descriptions of typically bad presentation, followed by contrasting descriptions of good presentation. The rules will be general and, it is hoped, applicable to the teaching of French, Spanish, German, or even English as a foreign language.

A bad book covers the pronunciation of the foreign language in no more than five or six pages. It presents its material in terms of letters and their "values," a term that is enough in itself to make the reader suspicious. A typical bad book presents in five and a half pages the pronunciation of Provencal for speakers of French. Its first statement reads as follows:

"The Provencal alphabet has twenty-three letters, five of which are vowels, and eighteen of which are consonants, pronounced as follows: 1] A, a, a preserve their alphabetic value." We have all seen many such descriptions, not only of rarer languages like Provencal, but of the great languages we are ordinarily called on to teach. All such descriptions seriously confuse speech and writing, and so make the teaching of speech more difficult.

A bad book, when it ventures to describe sounds at all, does so in vague or confusing terms. This Provencal grammar says that one sound "is pronounced ts or tz in a fashion intermediate between Spanish muchacho and Italian barbozza." The statement explains the unknown by the more unknown, since two other languages besides French and Provencal are introduced, only to say that Provencal is like neither of them. Sometimes the explanation can be merely verbal, as in the following drawn from a text which has been widely used in American classrooms. Of two sets of contrasting consonant types, one if called "soft and liquid" the other "hard and dry". The explanation is merely an elaboration of the folk term for one set, which is often called soft. If a text calls the vowels of a continental language clearer and more musical than their English equivalents, it is committing the same fault.

Even beyond the section on pronunciation, a bad book shows the effects of confusion between letters and sounds. Far too many grammars of English as a foreign language contain a statement we can remember from our own days in the schoolroom- "the plural of nouns is formed by adding -s or -es."Such a statement conceals the fact that there are three regular plurals, that found in dogs, that in cats, that in horses. (Pronounce them). Speakers of Spanish who have learned their English from such books, not unnaturally have difficulty in handling the distinction between dogs and docks. Not that spelling does not have its place in language instruction. A general principle, however, is that spelling is useful only when the student knows what it is that is being spelled. The quoted rule for the formation of the plural disregards this principle.

There is a second type which need not hold us long. Such books describe sounds, but in terms of the native language alone. They usually provide a system of spelling to indicate the pronunciation of words and phrases. The re-spelling, however, is not consistent and is meant to be read without special training, solely by means of the native alphabetic tradition. These books have their uses - for Latin they may be all that is needed. Most "phrase-books," telling the reader how to master French in six easy lessons, are prepared on this principle. Sometimes the re-spelling is remarkably ingenious, as in this form a phrase-book for GI's: "Rheims is pronounced like English Rance." Yet ingenious or not, all such presentations are open to a serious objection. They reinforce the student's naive belief that all languages are alike except for the words in them, and convince him that there is really little to learn.

In the paragraphs which follow, I shall try to say what a good book does about pronunciation. I should make it clear at the start, however, that I do not believe any description of sounds and how they are made can be a substitute for imitation of native or near-native speech. Furthermore, the younger the learner, the more reliance there should be on imitation, and the less on description. The purpose of description, and of drills based on description, is student's attention to exactly what he is trying to imitate, giving him some control of the mechanism of imitation, and organizing the drills so as to focus imitation on only a few features at a time, features which are then repeated until a habit is set up. Description of sounds, indeed, does not directly instruct the learner in how to produce them, and fails in any instance where the articulating organs are out of conscious control. The rr of Spanish perro cannot be taught to an English speaker who does not have it, by describing the action of the tongue. The teacher has to start from one of the many practical devices which have long been used in the classroom, such as modification of the brr which in English means "I'm cold." Similarly the guttural r of some varieties of German can be taught by starting from a snore. On the other hand, in all instances where the articulation can be consciously controlled, description is an indispensable tool. A Spaniard can be most easily taught to pronounce an English final m, for instance, by being told to close his lips. The usefulness of a good description is not denied if we recognize the truism that no one can learn a good pronunciation by reading about it. It is usual for all books except those for the youngest students to give some sort of systematic account of pronunciation. Such accounts must be as accurate as possible, and must at least not actively confuse the learner.

What then does a good book do about pronunciation? First, it describes the sounds of the foreign language accurately and fully in terms of articulation. It tells the reader, for example, that the tip of the tongue is against the back surface of the teeth in pronouncing a French or Spanish t. When the description has been given, it invites the student and teacher to compare articulatory positions in the native and the foreign language, so as to verify the difference described, and give the student a means of self-criticism. It may even recommend the use of a mirror, or feeling with the fingers, to observe articulation. Typically, there will be comparison of English two and Spanish tu, or the like. The student will be given the opportunity to observe that the first English sound (the t) is articulated farther back than the Spanish, and to observe and learn to hear the acoustic difference which results.

Second, a good book uses terminology which is technical it is true, but accurate and fully explained. Thus in describing the ts in two and tu it introduces the term aspiration, and explains that it means the puff of air which can be felt as part of the release of the t in two, but which is absent in stew and Spanish tu. It again invites student and teacher to verify by comparing the English and Spanish words. Such accurately defined terminology contrasts sharply with impressionistic names and descriptions. Students and teacher, once provided with the term aspiration, have a quick means of correction - the teacher can say,"Watch out, Mr. Jones, don't aspirate," and Mr. Jones knows what is meant and what to do about it. If the teacher can only say, "Make your t sharper and more metallic," the chances are Mr. Jones will go right on making an English T as he would have without any instruction at all.

A good book takes up matters of accent and intonation. If it is presenting English for the foreigner, it points out that brief case and briefcase are distinguished by their accents, a matter which speakers of a language with a different system of accentuation from our own, like Spanish or French, will slight unless they are warned to observe it. A good book will not stop with one or two examples, but will give a whole series of contrasting accent forms:

I saw him by the bank.	the greenhouse	light grey stone blocks
I saw him buy the bank.	the green house	light-grey stone blocks
	the Green house	light greystone blocks

The forms given are a few illustrations only from the many where distinctions in accent identify different utterances in English. The difference in accent should be presented, also, not merely for intellectual understanding, but as fundamental parts of the language, with copious drills. Intonation should be similarly treated, presenting the contrast between John went home, and John went home? for English, and furthermore, contrasting the intonation of the foreign language when it differs. Thus the intonation of some sentences of command differ in English and German. If an English sentence like "Mary, let's go home now," is contrasted with its literal equivalent in German, "Maria, lass uns jetzt nach Hause gehen," the German sentence shows a finality, a downward intonation, on the name Maria, like that we would give a word standing alone as a complete sentence. If we give the English sentence the same kind of treatment, "Mary. Let's go home now," we are being brusque or rude; in German, such treatment is merely normal and not associated with rudeness at all. The difference is not without social importance - we often react to German intonation patterns as if the German were being intentionally "Prussian." A good book presents all such matters of accent and intonation as parts of the language pattern, which differentiate utterances from one another, which vary from language to language, and which have to be learned by the student like the rest of the habits which make up the foreign tongue.

A good book is written from a thorough knowledge of the structure of both the native language and the foreign language. Its presentation of pronunciation is in terms of the similarities and differences between the two, and therefore recognizes that presentation of the same foreign language necessarily differs for two groups with differing native language. The description of Spanish for English students warns them that English diphthongizes the vowels in a phrase like "pay so" and that this is therefore

not an equivalent of Spanish peso. Such a warning would be superflucous in a grammar designed for speakers of French or Italian. Again, in a grammar of Spanish for speakers of English, little attention need be given to the Castilian pronunciation of a word like cinco or lápiz, since English has a readily available equivalent or near-equivalent. For a speaker of French or German, such a sound would need careful description, and directions for its production.

A good book presents sounds not alone in terms of what they are, but how they are arranged, again with careful attention to similarities and differences between foreign language and native language. For instance, it is not enough to say that Spanish has sounds approximately like (though with differences of detail) the d of den and the th of then. A good book explains that in normal Spanish, the d sound occurs after most consonants and pauses, the th sound between vowels. That is, donde has d's but in the phrase a donde, the first d becomes a th. A part of the arrangement of sounds, also, are the transitions between them. In consequence, a good book for Spanish would say that in ordinary conversation the two sentences: Es un hombre? and Es su nombre? would be indistinguishable. The kind of transitional pauses which an English speaker puts in to mark his word boundaries are often absent in Spanish - as many a student has found out to his sorrow when he hears natives speak the language he has painfully studied in school. Again, a part of arrangement of sounds is their sequences. Thus a good grammar of Spanish points out that the nasal consonants of un padre and un tio are different, since Spanish does not permit the sequence np without intervening pause. English does permit such sequences, so that the student must be warned against them.

The most important point yet mentioned is that a good book presents pronunciation in terms of contrasts, and of constrasts as they appear in normal and complete sentences. It is next to useless simply to list and describe English or French vowels. The sounds must be presented in words such as ship and sheep for English, patte and pate for French, and these constrasts then further placed in sentences such as "I saw a big ship," and "I saw a big sheep." Individual contrasts are not to be avoided; rather, once given, they should be illustrated from sentences which actually occur in speech.

A good book presents material on pronunciation, not only in its introductory chapters, but throughout the work, in terms of systematic re-spelling always together with ordinary orthography. Since such systems may, however, be used in confusing and harmful ways, some explanation of their purpose is necessary. Even with the so-called phonetic language like Spanish and Finnish, the ordinary orthography does not record all of the language. The features of pause, much of accentuation, and intonation have to be supplied by the teacher. If they are also given by a system of re-spelling in the textbook, the teacher's task is greatly lightened. With a language like English the importance of the re-spelling is much greater. Not only does English make many distinctions like that between the initial sounds of thy and thigh which are not shown in spelling at all, but has sequences like -ough in though, through, cough, enough and bough which have to be learned item by item. Time is therefore saved by a re-spelling which is consistent.

Re-spelling is no more than an aid to the learning of pronunciation, and secondarily an aid to learning the system by which pronunciation is partially recorded in orthography. If either book or teacher uses it otherwise, it is harmful. Damage was recently done unintentionally by a book prepared as a manual for writers of textbooks. The manual presented drills in re-spelling alone, leaving it to the textwriters to supply the orthographic version. When the book was unavoidably pressed into service as a textbook, students and teachers not unnaturally complained that they had to learn a "language of phonetics" and then learn English all over again after that. Again, as soon as a student or a class accomplishes the aims for which the re-spelling was devised, further attention to the system can be dropped. Yet since it is impossible for a textwriter to predict at exactly what point such mastery will be achieved, he provides the re-spelling throughout the book. If his student realizes that the re-spelling is provided as as aid, and not as something extra that must be mastered for itself, it is normally true that he will make good use of it. A not uncommon experience for teachers of English as a second language in classes which use some of the books now available in complete and systematic re-spelling, is to have members of the class correct an inadvertent misreading of intonation or accent.

It was stated above that re-spelling should be used throughout the book. An instance of its usefulness in sections other than those on pronunciation would be that a good statement of English noun plurals would say that there are three regular endings,/-s/, /-z/, and /-iz/, using re-spelling to indicate their sound, and using it further to indicate the sounds after which each one occurs. Moreover, when instruction in spelling is given, the sounds are first presented in the already learned re-spelling, and then the way they are represented in ordinary orthography is systematically explained. A useful English spelling rule is that a single consonant letter between vowel letters is an indication that the first vowel letter represents a diphthong, while two consonant letters in the same situation indicate that the first vowel letter spells a simple vowel. The rule is useless unless the student knows a re-spelling which gives the first vowel of liking as a diphthong, and the first vowel of licking as a simple vowel. The re-spelling is used not only in the introductory chapters, in grammatical presentation, in the treatment of spelling, but throughout in the drills which should accompany each chapter.

In the preceding pages we have been working with a single explicit assumption, that language is sound. Yet there has been another assumption implicit in all that we have said. This is that sounds make patterns of contrasts, and that these patterns differ from language to language quite as much as do the sounds themselves. The different treatment of d and th sounds in Spanish and English is an instance of pattern difference more important than difference in sound entities. The notion of patterning extends not only to sound, but to all parts of language, to grammar, syntax, and even to vocabulary. It is important to make the student recognize that when he has learned a vocabulary correspondence like hand-mano he has not yet learned all that is necessary, since Spanish employs mano where we would use coat in a coat of varnish, una mano de barniz. The patterning of grammar and vocabulary items is as important, and as unpredictable, as the patterning of sounds.

A third related assumption is that it is the formal differences in sound which make the differences in larger items, and so in turn make the differences in meaning possible. Differences in meaning are therefore best arrived at through study of the formal differences. The contrary assumption is that differences of meaning impose the formal differences, which are therefore secondary and unimportant. Yet the formal differences are the signals to which we respond, and which give us our knowledge of the meaning differences. If the reader says the two sentences, "They didn't have money to eat," and "They didn't have bread to eat," he will of course recognize that the phrase "to eat" has a differenct function in the two. If he compares his pronunciation of both, he should be able to recognize that eat gets a stronger accent in the first than in the second. Now let him try the first sentence with a nonsense word in place of money, "They didn't have cadsov to EAT." Pronounced in this way it is clear that cadsov is the same kind of thing as money, and is not something edible like bread.

Now does this assumption work out in the presentation of grammatical material? First, a good book presents drills designed to give the student habitual mastery of formal patterns; it does not present formal or even semantic principles as sole and sufficient guides. Thus for a Chinese student of English, sentences like "It's a nice day," must be drilled until they become an easily manipulated model into which other utterances like "It's raining, "It's hot" and so on can be fitted. Only if this mastery is given, will accompanying explanation of the use of the fictitious pronoun subject be fully useful.

Yet since books for more mature students find it useful to present systematic grammatical description as a supplement to drill, the assumption given necessarily affects this systematic reference material also. A bad book presents its account of grammatical classes primarily in terms of meaning. A good book presents them first in terms of their formal characteristics, with descriptions of meaning only after the formal characteristics have been used to isolate and identify the entities described. A typical bad presentation is one that we all remember -- 'A pronoun is a word used instead of a noun.' The definition does not define, since if a pronoun is a noun used for another noun, the definition is not needed. If on the other hand, a pronoun is not a noun, we are left to wonder what it is. A typically good presentation - and fortunately there are many such - begins by giving the inflectional forms of pronouns and, since the class is not large, listing the words that share them. Only thereafter does such a book go on to say that pronouns are used as noun substitutes, and to give the conditions under which the substitution takes place. In dealing with nouns, a good presentation begins by saying that English nouns have two cases and two numbers, and can be preceded by articles and adjectives in the same phrase. When such characteristics have been given, it may go on to say that nouns correspond fairly well with the category of things in the real world. A good presentation will, however, never use a category of "thingness" to define such a word as whiteness or penetration as a noun. Definition, in short, should precede description. If the class of nouns has first been isolated so that the student knows what words belong in the class, description of the class is genuinely useful, though of course its value is in contributing to the intellectual understanding of language structure, not to the learning of language habits. To draw a parallel, one would not attempt to decide that a particular living being was a man or an ape by describing all the important accomplishments of mankind; it would be far more useful to stick to the anthrolpologists' defining differential "man alone has an opposed thumb."

The attitude that it is better to work through the formal characteristics to arrive at functions and meanings affects the presentation of language material in other ways also. In general, a book is to be condemned if it sets up classes for which there are no formal differentiating characteristics, or which conflict with them. Usually the reason for setting up such classes is an introduction of history at a point where it is confusing, or an attempt to fit all languages into a classic mold. Thus, for instance, it is defensible to talk about uses of the verb in English which correspond to subjunctive forms in other languages. Such forms as "if this be treason" can then be called subjunctive uses. It is certainly wasteful to set up a complete paradigm for a subjunctive mood in English, however, since all the forms which occur in subjunctive uses occur elsewhere in the verb inflection, and there are no special subjunctive endings. Again, in the treatment of English verb forms for the learner of the language it is confusing to list the forms according to their various Old English classes, as at least one grammar does. In the presentation of German, the historical origin of the umlaut vowels can easily be pressed beyond the point of usefulness. Yet a simple structural parallel between the umlaut plurals of man and Mann may well interest the student and act as a worthwhile mnemonic device.

The presentation of grammatical material, syntactic patterns, even of vocabulary differences, like the presentation of sounds, proceeds from a thorough knowledge of both the native and the foreign language. Such a knowledge is not merely the ability to speak both languages fluently, but is much more an analysis of both structures, and the resultant ability to describe both similarities and differences. A good book wastes little time, however, with the similarities, and directs its attention instead to the differences. A Spanish grammar for speakers of English need not list all the uses of the Spanish definite article, since many are similar to English. An instance of what should be pointed out is the Spanish use of the definite article with parts of the body and intimate possessions, where we use a pronoun possessive. That is, Spanish says "he bumped the head," where we say "his head." If, on the other hand, Spanish is being presented for speakers of a Slavic tongue, the treatment of the definite article will have to be full and detailed. Once more, the problem is different for each languarge group.

Next, a good book provides drills for all phases of the material presented. So indeed, do many bad books, though with a difference. A bad book presents a set of sentences to be laboriously translated, employing many different constructions in any one of which the student can make a mistake. We all remember the sets of Latin sentences, employing ablative absolutes, gerunds and gerundives, accusatives of extent of time, and so on, through which we struggled. Such sentences could be solved only like crossword puzzles, and for most of us they never led to any fluency in Latin. Drills which present the student with the whole of the language at once always make him stop and think and search his memory for the right form. Yet to talk we have to be so habituated to the proper form that it comes out automatically. If we have to search for it, the conversation has left us long before we arrive at the proper answer. Drills which consist solely of paradigms may be a hindrance, since students often cannot bring out the proper form without running over the whole set first. A familiar example of this sort of fault is the student who cannot name the day of the week without starting with Monday.

A well constructed drill turns on a single contrast, and asks the student only to supply the proper form A or form B, always within a single frame. A proper drill for English might turn on this simple sentence frame:

I _____ go to the bank, this morning.

The blank should be filled with normal verbs like want, hope, plan and so on, all of which must be followed by to,and then by can, may, will and shall which omit the to. The drill should give ample opportunity for oral practice, until the student acquires a habit, much in the fashion that an American child acquires the habit of using or dropping to in this construction, before he is five years old. Can go and want to go represent a basically formal and arbitrary difference, and here as often in language no semantic or historical discussion is very helpful. The learner of English does not need to know the intricacies of preteritive-present verbs in Germatic; he needs only the habit of saying can go.

A good approach to such a Spanish problem as order in adjectives will similarly be based on drill, and, as we have been trying to suggest, the drill will be split into separate sets, each involving a small point in structure. A good drill can be made on nothing more than Spanish todos and ambos. Todos has many of the same order characteristics as English all, and there is one-for-one correspondence between todos los hombres and all the men. But ambos does not go with todos in the same way that both goes with all. That is, we can say all the men, or both the men: in Spanish, on the other hand, we can say only todos los hombres, not ambos los hombres. Subsequent drills, based on accurate surveys of Spanish habits, would then be devoted to adjectives which occur before and after the noun, those which occur in both positions with change of meaning, those which occur in both positions with change of form, and so on.

A good book does not present a language as a set of contrasts in a vacuum, but rather as a system which is intimately connected with other human activities, habits, and values. Indeed, it is ultimately this connection that we are talking about when we say that language has meaning, and which gives language its transcendant importance in our daily lives. A presentation of German should give the conditions under which a German addresses another as du,and will compare these with the conditions under which an American uses a first name. Not the least value of such an approach is that it brings into the student's awareness some of his own cultural habits, which he has probably taken for granted as instinctive. The German book should also pay some attention to the body movements which accompany speech, pointing out that Germans of different social status stand slightly farther from each other in talking than do speakers of similar status in English. This kind of information should then be related to the description of the use of du. There should also be some mention of levels of usage, realistically described in terms of the social responses that variant forms call forth. It should be emphasized that all such correlation with other habits and with social values is not a mere "talking about the language," of the sort rightly condemned as a turning aside from learning it. It is rather the necessary flesh and blood which makes a skeleton structure a living body.

The mention of the correlation of language with a community's set of values brings us inevitably to the subject of literature and reading in the language classroom. The emphasis so far given has been on language as speech, so that a false impression may have been inadvertently created. Literature is of the greatest importance in language training, and is often enough the student's real aim in study. But before such reading can be profitable, a good deal of preliminary training is necessary. The great works of literature abroad, as at home, are often considerably removed from contemporary speech. Such works as Don Quixote or Hamlet can be meaningfully read only when the student has gained some command of the patterns of the language. Since we cannot carry on conversation in Spanish of the Golden Age, or in Elizabethan English, the only way in which the student can be drilled in language patterns is through practice in living speech. The aim of those who want to read literature has then to be the same in the beginning stages as for those who want to learn the language so as to get a job abroad - for that matter, the same as those who merely want to meet a language requirement. All must be given skill in handling patterns of speech. Specialization must come later.

For these reasons, the classics do not belong in the beginning class. Most of us have seen the results of premature literary study in the foreigner who has been dragged through a Shakespeare play but is unable to communicate in any recognizable form of English. In the beginning class, the place of the classics might well be taken by carefully graded readers whose content is the normal habits and beliefs of the foreign community - for instance, Spanish habits of dress. For lack of such training on both sides of the language barrier, American tourists often give offense by dressing in shorts on the street, and Latins all too often have an impression of immorality in American life based on just this American ignorance of foreign ways.

The content of the reader should be presented in a structurally organized fashion. That is, each section should make use of a single type of grammatical contrast. Happily there is at least one such reader for English, in which home life in an average American town is so described. Each chapter deals with some such structural point as "it is raining now" in contrast with "it rains every day." The language should be simplified in two ways. There should not be much strange vocabulary. The new words and phrases should be given at a constant rate, and with constant re-employment. The vocabulary should be carefully scrutinized to make sure that new items do not slip in carelessly. An otherwise excellent reader contains a schoolgirl's question, "Where's my English book?" The phrase evidently slipped by the compiler without his realizing that it is a special construction, "book for a class in English literature or composition," not the more predictable phrase "book from England."

The second sense in which the language should be simplified is in the number of grammatical constructions used. If the simplification is in vocabulary alone, the result is to throw complicated constructions at the student before he is ready for them. A horrifying example of such simplification of vocabulary without simplification of constructions is this sentence brought to me by a Japanese student of English from the first chapter of her reader: "It is thinking that makes what we read our own." Often in readers where the vocabulary has been thus simplified, it is easy to discover an underlying confusion between the adult foreigner and the native child. One whole

series of English readers for foreigners is organized around keeping the vocabulary monosyllabic. The simplified language must be strictly natural. Often enough it is quaint and unpredictable, as in this sentence from an English reader in use in Italy - "What does Miss Blackhead bid?" (Miss Blackhead is a teacher of English, not a bridge player.) A slightly less repulsive example is this from a reader widely used in America - "After she has powdered her face..." (American girls usually powder their noses.) More importantly, grammatical simplification may be done so as to do violence to structure. In a set of English materials used in the Orient, all verbs are used in the simple present ("It rains now,") in the early chapters, because the "is raining" construction is regarded as too difficult.

Up to this point we have been talking about how the language teacher can select already prepared material. Far more important is what he does in his own classroom. Much of what will be said on this subject is application of the same principles which govern the compilation of a good text. Much more is confirmation of what has been practiced in language classes by good teachers at any time. The linguistic scientists' recommendations are not new or revolutionary doctrine, but simply recommendations of what those linguists who are also practical language teachers have found to be effective. Many language teachers are now provided with books which use the type of re-spelling described earlier. Such a text puts a burden on the teacher, since he must learn to read it in a consistent fashion, giving the sounds, accent, and intonation that the re-spelling calls for. The task, however, is not as heavy as the unfamiliarity of the symbols would suggest. The teacher already has command of the language, so that if he pronounces a sentence at all, it will be in a possible form. The re-spelling is consistent, so that when sound and symbol are correlated, they are learned once and for all. Any such text will provide descriptions of acceptable dialect variants, and direct the teacher to use his natural form when there is such an alternative. The re-spelling does not direct him to learn a new kind of speech, since he already speaks in an acceptable fashion. If he pronounces Spanish cinco with an s or beard without an r, he need do no more than call the attention of his class to a dialect variant. When it is once possible to read the re-spelling consistently, the teacher is repaid in the speed and accuracy with which he can make distinctions and corrections. He can also lead his class to pronounce sentences so that they sound like natural and expressive language, not like separate and meaningless words.

The teacher will often be called on to design oral drills supplementing those he takes from his text. All that has been said about good and bad drills applies as well to those the teacher designs as to those he merely adopts. In pronunciation, the first drills should be in recognition of the foreign distinctions, with the student responding by number or some other device which does not involve producing the foreign sounds. Ability to recognize by no means guarantees ability to produce, but a student has no chance of producing a distinction until he has learned to hear it.

At later stages, reading aloud is useful. The first reading should be of texts already learned from a version in the re-spelling, read without reference to the re-spelling except for correction. When the students advance to reading without the re-spelling aid, the aim should be to see that they recognize the correlation, imperfect though it may be, between punctuation

and the expressive properties - accent, intonation, pause - of speech. It is a minor point, but one worth making, that it is by no means always necessary to make a student trasnlate a passage to determine whether he has understood it. If he reads the passage expressively, this is often evidence enough of understanding. After reading exercises have been introduced, dictation can be employed, again with the same aim, that of drilling on the correlation between punctuation and the expressive qualities of speech. Dictation should never be given in the form "John went home question mark," but naturally, leaving the student to recognize that the sentence is a question from the way it sounds.

Drills should be as nearly as possible at normal speed, allowing the student to catch up by pauses placed at normal breaks in the sentence. It is important to recognize that slow speech is often - if not usually - distorted speech. If the teacher is able to train himself to slow speech which is not distorted, slow speech becomes very valuable indeed, but such training is difficult. Speakers, at least of the literate Western languages, have long been trained in a bookish formal style used when speaking slowly, and which differs greatly from the forms of conversation. When a speaker of a Western language slows his speech, he automatically falls into the bookish style. A sentence like "Don't you want a cup of coffee?" employs forms like "doncha" and "cuppa" in all normal conversation, though it is difficult to represent such forms in ordinary spelling without creating a false impression of illiteracy, which is a heritage of dialect writing. The reader should compare a slow and a rapid pronunciation of the sentence. In slow speech he will use separate and distinct consonants for don't and the following pronoun, a clearly pronounced t in want, and an equally clearly pronounced v (not f of course) in of. In rapid speech all these features are slurred, by both educated and uneducated speakers. It is not here argued that the conversational style in a normal and necessary part of the language, and not a mark of carelessness or lack of education.

If the teacher can produce slow speech only in the bookish style, his only chance of introducing students to the conversational style that they must master if they are to use the language, is to talk at conversational tempo. If the teacher is enough of a virtuoso to be able to day "doncha" at half speed and without distortion, then he has at his disposal one of the most effective teaching devices there is. The distorting effect of the bookish style is amply born out by classroom experience. With learners of English, one of the first tasks is to convince them that Americans really say things like "I'm going," or "I'll go," instead of the formal "I am going" and "I will go." They have seen the formal style in books and think of it as normal, so that they have great difficulty with even such simple conversational sentences as those given.

What the teacher does in his classroom can be seriously affected, for good or bad, by his ideas of usage. The teacher should use as good and as educated a form of speech as he can, but if his speech is not that of some body of native speakers, he is a bad model. I have known at least one teacher of German who regularly pronounced all hs, even that of gehen, a pronunciation as unreal as insisting on the first d in Wednesday. A markedly formal pro-

nunciation, if genuine even though uncommon, like the stage pronunciation of German, can be objected to only if it is the only type to which the student is exposed. If he gets some practice in a more conversational style, but himself adopts the state pronunciation, he should be able to understand and to talk,both acceptably.

All good teachers are aware of differences in rapid and slow style, and informal and formal speech, and all attempt to deal with them in some fashion. Yet a common solution to the problem is to try to produce a compromise style suitable for all occasions. Standard languages serve a part of this purpose, and should always be taught to the exclusion of local dialects, or speech without social prestige. Yet the attempt to construct a single form of speech for all class purposes is open to some objections. The matter of speed of utterance can be controlled, but the effects of speed cannot. If the sentence used is "Don't you want a cup of coffee?" there comes a point in any series of utterances graded by speed, at which there is a dividing line between the bookish and the colloquial forms. The only way in which a compromise form could be set up would be to give, say, the bookish form for don't you , and the colloquial form for cup of. Since such compromise forms are therefore apt either not to be genuine compromises, or to be unreal mixtures, it is simpler and more accurate to expose the student systematically to more than one type of speech, of the sorts that he is likely to encounter.

Far more serious than an unreal type of speech is confusion between native mistakes and those the foreigner is prone to. The native mistakes are the use of a form belonging to a definite social level on another level of higher prestige, which makes the form inappropriate. The foreigner's mistakes are carry-overs from his native language, so that the form produced is not English at all. The confusion has been very frequent in classes of English for foreigners, since until recently teachers of such classes usually had a background solely in the instruction of native speakers. Thus an English class for speakers of Polish at least once spent a whole session on the proper use of shall and will,and I know of a book for speakers of Chinese which warns very carefully against splitting infinitives. Both of these mistakes would be committed only by a native. A foreigner who actually splits an infinitive is making progress toward some form of colloquial English, perhaps not just what we would choose for him, but progress none the less. In short, a teacher should produce an acceptable variety of the foreign language, and not worry too much over whether he speaks exactly like his colleagues. If they too produce an acceptable variety, it is to the student's advantage to become acquainted with more than one normal type. Again, the teacher should examine his list of errors to be avoided, and make sure that they are errors the foreigner is prone to. If they are native errors, he can well dismiss them from his mind. For speakers of Spanish a genuine error is failure to distinguish no and not; an occasional form like he don't can be dismissed with no more than passing mention.

Two matters can conclude this discussion. The first is the "direct method," still used, though no longer without modification, in most schools. Throughout these pages it has been said, in as many ways as possible, that language is pattern - patterns of sound, of words, of phrases and sentences. The native speaker moves through these patterns, making expansions, substitutions, and contractions without thinking about them, without real awareness. The

patterns have become habits so deeply embedded in the early years of his adjustment to his community that they seem to him almost instinctive. There is no way in which an adult can acquire a new set of such habits except by initial intellectual understanding, backed by drill which transforms the understanding into automatic response. The intellectual understanding is of great value to the adult, but without the following drill it is useless. The direct method, rigidly followed, gives no initial understanding of the patterns, since it rules out communication in the known tongue. Similarly, it gives drill, it is true, but seldom in the systematic form which is most helpful.

In its history, the direct method was a healthy revolt against over-complicated grammatical analysis, and against the translation approach. It has the virtue of exposing the student to large amounts of the foreign tongue, and succeeds better than any method which does not do so. It is a truism that one cannot learn French by talking about it; one learns French by talking French. In practice, however, the direct method assumes that the adult learner is exactly like the native child, unsophisticated in any language and with five years or more in which to do nothing but learn to talk. The amount of time the direct method can waste is, to say the least, discouraging. A teacher who begins with a sentence like "los libros estan en la mesa," without some reference to translation, gets a collection of random guesses like "made of wood," "in English," "in front of you," and so on.

A sensible plan, instead of the direct method, is initial explanation, as accurate and simple as possible, in the native language, followed by drill aimed at the acquisition of patterns. Each sentence learned should be a frame for expansion and substitution, so that the student begins to talk controlled and minimal bits of the language. Such a Spanish sentence as that given above should be followed by substitution drill using such words as silla, sala, to be followed by others with change of gender or number. The aim of all such drill can be summed up by saying its purpose is to teach a little of the language at a time very well, rather than a lot of the language at once and badly.

The last matter is the vexed question of the native or non-native teacher. The native teacher often enjoys a prestige which his American colleagues do not reach. Yet to say that only a native can teach a language is nearly equivalent to saying that no one can learn a second language. It is true that an adult almost never learns a new tongue without slight trace of a foreign accent, so that it is always important that students hear considerable native speech as a model. But except for this, there is little to choose between native and well-trained American. Granted that the American commands the language, his excellence as a teacher depends on his professional competence as a classroom teacher, as explainer of language forms, and as designer of effective drills. If the teacher is a native, his excellence depends on the same qualifications, plus the fact that what he gains in command of the language to be learned he may lose in command of English.

In many schools, however, no native speaker is available, so that American teachers have no one to consult if they wish to investigate a point of usage, and the students have no perfect model for pronunciation. In such a situation much can yet be done. One modern solution is extensive use of record-

ings. Another is a determined search for a native, not to act as a member of the faculty, but as an assistant whose job it is to talk, so that he can be observed and imitated. In all large cities and even in many small ones such native models are available, sometimes on a volunteer basis. One native can enormously improve the teaching situation by making recordings, or by coming to class at intervals and talking long enough to convince the students that what they are studying is a genuine and living vehicle of human communication.

In closing I return to my starting point. Language teachers have an important job, and they are devoted to doing it. Linguistic scientists also have an important job, to which they are also devoted. Their results are fragmentary - as are those of all science -- but important, and growing in importance. It is unthinkable that the enormous task of unlocking the language barrier will not be one in which teacher and investigator cooperate in friendly fashion. All that the investigator can tell the teacher about the system of language, and how to exploit it in presentation, will benefit the classroom. All that the teacher can tell the investigator about students' responses, failures, and successes will benefit the investigation of how language works.